



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,407	11/02/2001	Donald J. Stavely	10019757 -1	9397

7590 04/20/2005  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

JELINEK, BRIAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2615

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/005,407

Applicant(s)

STAVELY ET AL.

Examiner

Brian Jelinek

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 and 40-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 40-47 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Amendment***

The Examiner respectfully submits a response to the amendment received on 3/10/2005 of application no. 10/005,407 filed on 11/2/2001 in which claims 1-31, and 40-47 are currently pending.

***Drawings***

The Examiner respectfully withdraws the "Prior Art" objection to the drawings; and furthermore, thanks the Applicant for correcting the drawings.

***Arguments***

Regarding claim 1, 8, and 15, the Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please refer to the following office action, which clearly sets forth the reasons for non-persuasiveness. The Applicant argues that Dow fails to disclose the "preferred image" is a user-designated image. Although the Examiner understands the Applicant's invention, the language "preferred image" and "user-designated preferred image" are overly broad to distinguish the Applicant's invention over Dow. In particular, the Examiner maintains that the first image that is displayed in a group of images, according to the disclosure of Dow, is reasonably defined as a "preferred image". Furthermore, this preferred image is clearly user-designated since it is displayed when the user navigates by pressing a button to another group of images.

Regarding claim 23, the Applicant argues that Anderson discloses marking images to reorder them; and the claimed invention designates a preferred image without reordering. The Examiner understands the Applicant's invention and the Applicant's definition of "reordering", wherein a preferred image may be displayed without altering the logical relationship between images, i.e. adjacent images remain adjacent images after a new preferred image is designated. However, regardless of the logical ordering of the images, both Dow, in combination with Anderson, and the claimed invention change the order in which images are displayed, thus enabling different images in a group to be displayed first upon user navigation to that group. Consequently, the claimed invention effects reordering of the images since a new preferred image is preferentially displayed over an old preferred image.

Regarding claim 40, the Applicant's arguments, see Remarks (pg. 12, par 2), filed 3/10/2005, with respect to the most recently selected (viewed) image have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 40 has been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dow et al. (EP Pub. No. EP 0 978 987 A2 ).**

Regarding claim 1, Dow et al. teaches an image browsing user interface (col. 2, lines 51-54), comprising: a display (Fig. 1A, element 24); and a first function (Fig. 1A, elements 46 and 48) to select for viewing on the display an image belonging to a set of images (identified by the license plate number, e.g. Fig. 6, set 16), the set of images comprising at least one user-designated preferred image (i.e. an individual image or the first image of a group of images), each user-designated preferred image belonging to a group of images.

Regarding claim 2, Dow et al. teaches a second function (Fig. 1A, elements 42 and 44) to select for viewing on the display at least one image belonging to a group of images (Fig. 9A, 9B, and 9C), when the first function has selected the user-designated preferred image (Fig. 9A) within the group of images.

Regarding claim 3, Dow et al. teaches a third function to designate, in response to user input, the user-designated preferred image within a group of images, where a "live arrow" designates the first image in a group of images (e.g. 1/13) (Fig. 9A).

Regarding claim 4, Dow et al. teaches the third function designates as the user-designated preferred image the most recently selected image within the group of images because it is inherent that when the most recently selected image is the first image in a group of images it will be designated as a preferred image (e.g. 1/13) (Fig. 9A).

Regarding claim 5, Dow et al. teaches the set of images contains at least one individual image (Figs. 6).

Regarding claim 6, Dow et al. teaches the first function comprises a first pair of opposing directional modes, and the second function comprises a second pair of opposing directional modes that is orthogonal to the first pair of opposing directional modes (Fig. 1A, elements 46 and 48, 42 and 44).

Regarding claim 8, Dow et al. teaches an image browsing user interface (col. 2, lines 51-54), comprising: means for displaying at least one image (Fig. 1A, element 24); and first input means (Fig. 1A, elements 46 and 48) for selecting for display an image belonging to a set of images (identified by the license plate number, e.g. Fig. 6, set 16), the set of images comprising at least one user-designated preferred image (i.e. an individual image or the first image of a group of images), each user-designated preferred image belonging to a group of images.

Regarding claim 9, Dow et al. teaches a second input means (Fig. 1A, elements 42 and 44) for selecting for display at least one image belonging to a group of images (Fig. 9A, 9B, and 9C), when the first input means has selected the user-designated preferred image within the group of images.

Regarding claim 10, Dow et al. teaches a third input means (Fig. 1A, element 42 and 44) for designating, in response to user input, the user-designated preferred image within a group of images, where a "live arrow" designates the first image in a group of images (e.g. 1/13) (Fig. 9A).

Regarding claim 11, Dow et al. teaches the third input means designates as the user-designated preferred image the most recently selected image within the group of images because it is inherent that when the most recently selected image is the first

image in a group of images it will be designated as a preferred image (e.g. 1/13) (Fig. 9A).

Regarding claim 12, Dow et al. teaches the set of images contains at least one individual image (Fig. 6).

Regarding claim 13, Dow et al. teaches the first input means comprises a first pair of opposing directional modes, and the second input means comprises a second pair of opposing directional modes that is orthogonal to the first pair of opposing directional modes (Fig. 1A, elements 46 and 48, 42 and 44).

Regarding claim 15, Dow et al. teaches a digital camera (Fig. 1A), comprising: an optical system, which is inherent in an image capture device; an imaging device to convert optical images received from the optical system to corresponding digital images (col. 7, lines 1-3); a memory to store the digital images (Fig. 2, element 74); a display (Fig. 1A, element 24); control logic (Fig. 2) configured to designate, in response to user input, a user-designated preferred digital image (i.e. an individual image or the first image of a group of images) within each of at least one group of digital images, where a "live arrow" designates the first image in a group of images (e.g. 1/13) (Fig. 9A); a first input control to select for viewing on the display a digital image belonging to a set of digital images (identified by the license plate number, e.g. Fig. 6, set 16), the set of digital images comprising at least one user-designated preferred digital image (i.e. an individual image or the first image of a group of images); and a second input control (Fig. 1A, elements 42 and 44) to select for viewing on the display at least one digital image belonging to a group of digital images (Figs. 9B and 9C), when the first input

control has selected the user-designated preferred digital image within the group of digital images.

Regarding claim 16, Dow et al. teaches the control logic designates the most recently selected digital image within each group of digital images as the preferred digital image because it is inherent that when the most recently selected image is the first image in a group of images it will be designated as a user-designated preferred image (e.g. 1/13) (Fig. 9A).

Regarding claim 17, Dow et al. teaches the set of images contains at least one individual image (Fig. 6).

Regarding claim 18, Dow et al. teaches the first input control comprises a first pair of opposing directional modes, and the second input control comprises a second pair of opposing directional modes that is orthogonal to the first pair of opposing directional modes (Fig. 1A, elements 46 and 48, 42 and 44).

Regarding claim 19, Dow et al. teaches the first pair of opposing directional modes lies horizontally with respect to a housing of the digital camera and the second pair of opposing directional modes lies vertically with respect to the housing of the digital camera (Fig. 1A, elements 46 and 48, 42 and 44), where the reference line of the housing is taken to be the bottom edge of the image capture device.

Regarding claim 20, Dow et al. teaches the first pair of opposing directional modes lies vertically with respect to a housing of the digital camera and the second pair of opposing directional modes lies horizontally with respect to the housing of the digital



Art Unit: 2615

camera (Fig. 1A, elements 46 and 48, 42 and 44), where the reference line of the housing is taken to be the left edge of the image capture device.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 7, 14, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow et al. (EP Pub. No. EP 0 978 987 A2) in view of Kawaoka et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,801,251).**

Regarding claim 7, Dow et al. teaches deleting a page or group of pages from memory (Fig. 2, element 94). Dow et al. does not teach a fourth function to delete all images except those belonging to the set of images.

However, Kawaoka et al. teaches determining a representative image for each group of a plurality of groups of images and deleting all images except those that belong to the set of representative images with an "inputted deleted command" (Fig. 14; col. 12, lines 2-11 and 20-35). One of ordinary skill in the art would have determined a representative image for each group of a plurality of groups of images for the purpose of creating a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events (Fig. 16); furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have deleted all images except those

that belong to the set of representative images because only the representative images are necessary in order to synthesize a composite image (col. 12, lines 23-26). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a fourth function to delete all images except those belonging to the set of images because only the representative images are necessary in order to synthesize a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events.

Regarding claim 14, Dow et al. teaches deleting a page or group of pages from memory (Fig. 2, element 94). Dow et al. does not teach a fourth input means for deleting all images except those belonging to the set of images.

However, Kawaoka et al. teaches determining a representative image for each group of a plurality of groups of images and deleting all images except those that belong to the set of representative images with an "inputted deleted command" (Fig. 14; col. 12, lines 2-11 and 20-35). One of ordinary skill in the art would have determined a representative image for each group of a plurality of groups of images for the purpose of creating a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events (Fig. 16); furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have deleted all images except those that belong to the set of representative images because only the representative images are necessary in order to synthesize a composite image (col. 12, lines 23-26). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a fourth input means comprising a "delete input command" for deleting all images except those belonging to the set of images because only the

representative images are necessary in order to synthesize a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events.

Regarding claim 21, Dow et al. teaches deleting a page or group of pages from memory (Fig. 2, element 94). Dow et al. does not teach a third input control to delete all digital images except those belonging to the set of digital images.

However, Kawaoka et al. teaches determining a representative image for each group of a plurality of groups of images and deleting all images except those that belong to the set of representative images with an "inputted delete command" (Fig. 14; col. 12, lines 2-11 and 20-35). One of ordinary skill in the art would have determined a representative image for each group of a plurality of groups of images for the purpose of creating a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events (Fig. 16); furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have deleted all images except those that belong to the set of representative images because only the representative images are necessary in order to synthesize a composite image (col. 12, lines 23-26). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a third input control to delete all digital images except those belonging to the set of digital images comprising a "delete input command" for deleting all images except those belonging to the set of images because only the representative images are necessary in order to synthesize a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events.

Regarding claim 22, Dow et al. teaches a communication interface configured to transfer pages or groups of pages to an external device (col. 6, lines 50-56; Fig. 2,

Art Unit: 2615

element 96). Dow et al. does not specifically teach transferring at least the set of digital images to an external device.

However, Kawaoka et al. teaches transferring all of the images stored in the image capture device to an image synthesizer (col. 13, lines 16-24). One of ordinary skill in the art would have transferred all of the images stored in the image capture device to an image synthesizer, including the set of digital images, in order to sequentially display all of the images (col. 13, lines 16-24). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have transferred all of the images stored in the image capture device to an image synthesizer, including the set of digital images, in order to sequentially display all of the images.

**Claims 23-25, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow et al. (EP Pub. No. EP 0 978 987 A2 ), in view of Anderson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,316).**

Regarding claim 23, Dow et al. teaches a method for manipulating images stored in a device, comprising: selecting for display at least one image belonging to both a first (Fig. 9A, set 17) and a second set (Figs. 9A, 9B, and 9C) of images using a first control (Fig. 1A, elements 46 and 48); selecting for display at least one image belonging to the second set of images using a second control (Fig. 9B; Fig. 1A, elements 42 and 44). Dow et al. further teaches designating, in response to user input, a user-designated preferred image (i.e. an individual image or the first image of a group of images) within a

group of images with a “live arrow” which designates the first image in a group of images (e.g. 1/13) (Fig. 9A). Dow et al. does not teach designating one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images as a user-designated preferred image, the user-designated preferred image thereby becoming a member of both the first and second sets of images.

However, Anderson teaches a selection rectangle and a “mark” button may be used to number a group of images by selecting and then marking each image in a series of images, allowing a user to dynamically reorder the images in a group of images (col. 8, lines 1-9). One of ordinary skill in the art would have provided the capability to mark one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images as a preferred image (i.e. the first image in a group of images) in order to enable a user to dynamically reorder the images in a group of images, the preferred image thereby becoming a member of both the first and second sets of images (col. 8, lines 1-9). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have designated one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images as a user-designated preferred image using a selection rectangle and mark button in order to dynamically reorder the images in a group of images, the user-designated preferred image thereby becoming a member of both the first and second sets of images.

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Dow et al. and Anderson teach designating, in response to user input, one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images as a user-designated preferred image (please see the 103

rejection of claim 23). Furthermore, it is clear that designating the user-designated preferred image is performed in response to at least one image not belonging to the second set of images being selected using the first control (Dow: Fig. 9A) because it is necessary to navigate to the first set of images (Dow: Fig. 9A, set 17) before navigating to the second set of images (Dow: Fig. 9B and 9C). Further still, it is clear that the user-designated preferred image comprises the most recently selected image from among the at least one images belonging to the second set of images because when an image in a group of images is marked as image "1", it is the most recently selected image (Anderson: col. 7, lines 49-52).

Regarding claim 25, Anderson further teaches that designating, in response to user input, an image as the user-designated preferred image comprises tagging the image with a "1" so that the image is reorded as the first image in the group (Fig. 11; col. 8, lines 1-9). One of ordinary skill in the art would have designated the first image by embedding the tag "1" within the image to enable a user to see the order in which they have marked a group of images for reording (col. 8, lines 1-9). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have designated one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images as a user-designated preferred image by embedding a tag within the one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images to enable a user to see the order in which they have marked a group of images for reording.

Regarding claim 31, Dow et al. teaches the device is a digital camera, a palmtop computer, a PDA, a personal computer, or a communicator phone (Fig. 1A, element 22).

**Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow et al. (EP Pub. No. EP 0 978 987 A2 ), in view of Anderson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,316), and further in view of Aoi et al. (U.S. Appl. No. 2003/0169349 A1).**

Regarding claim 26, Anderson further teaches that designating, in response to user input, an image as the user-designated preferred image comprises tagging an image with a "1" so that the image is reorded as the first image in the group (Fig. 11; col. 8, lines 1-9). Anderson does not teach the setting of a directory attribute.

However, Aoi et al. teaches a naming and file structure for tagging single images and groups of images in order to indicate the directory of a group of images (Fig. 3, DIRECTORY), the sequence in which a series of images were captured (Fig. 3, index number of image file in FILE NAME column, e.g. "3432", "3433", etc.), and the group to which a particular image belongs (Fig. 3, GROUP column, letter in FILE NAME column, e.g. "STA", "STB", etc). Aoi et al. further teaches a file having file head "STA" represents a file at the head of a group of images and that the order of generation and storage of data can be decided by including a character showing a component of the group (e.g. "A", "B", "C", etc.) (para 116 and 117). One of ordinary skill in the art would have designated a preferred image belonging to a second set of images by embedding the "STA" file head tag in the file name of the preferred image in order to "quickly

correspond to the case in which a user arranges data" (para 117). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have designated one of the images belonging to the second set of images as a user-designated preferred image by embedding the "STA" file head tag within the one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images in order to "quickly correspond to the case in which a user arranges data".

Regarding claim 27, Anderson further teaches that designating, in response to user input, an image as a user-designated preferred image comprises tagging an image with a "1" so that the image is reorded as the first image in the group (Fig. 11; col. 8, lines 1-9). Anderson does not teach adding to a list of user-designated preferred images an identifier corresponding to an image belonging to a second set of images.

However, Aoi et al. teaches a naming and file structure for tagging single images and groups of images in order to indicate the directory of a group of images (Fig. 3, DIRECTORY), the sequence in which a series of images were captured (Fig. 3, index number of image file in FILE NAME column, e.g. "3432", "3433", etc.), and the group to which a particular image belongs (Fig. 3, GROUP column, letter in FILE NAME column, e.g. "STA", "STB", etc). Aoi et al. further teaches a file having file head "STA" represents a file at the head of a group of images and that the order of generation and storage of data can be decided by including a character showing a component of the group (e.g. "A", "B", "C", etc.) (para 116 and 117). It is clear that reording a group of images such that a different image becomes the preferred image requires renaming the new preferred image with file head "STA". One of ordinary skill in the art would have



Art Unit: 2615

provided the file head "STA" identifier to the file name of the new preferred image in the file name list (comprising a list of preferred images) (Fig. 3) for the purpose of identifying a new first image in a group of images (para 116 and 117). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have designated one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images as a user-designated preferred image by adding to a list of user-designated preferred images an identifier corresponding to the one of the at least one images belonging to the second set of images for the purpose of identifying a new first image in a group of images.

**Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow et al. (EP Pub. No. EP 0 978 987 A2 ), in view of Anderson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,316) in view of Kawaoka et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,801,251).**

Regarding claim 28, Dow et al. teaches deleting a page or group of pages from memory (Fig. 2, element 94). Dow et al. does not teach deleting all images stored in the device except those belonging to the first set of images.

However, Kawaoka et al. teaches determining a representative image for each group of a plurality of groups of images and deleting all images except those that belong to the set of representative images with an "inputted deleted command" (Fig. 14; col. 12, lines 2-11 and 20-35). One of ordinary skill in the art would have determined a representative image for each group of a plurality of groups of images for the purpose of creating a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events (Fig. 16);

Art Unit: 2615

furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have deleted all images except those that belong to the set of representative images because only the representative images are necessary in order to synthesize a composite image (col. 12, lines 23-26). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have deleted all images stored in the device except those belonging to the first set of images with a "delete input command" because only the representative images are necessary in order to synthesize a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events.

Regarding claim 29, Dow et al. teaches uploading pages or groups of pages to an external device (col. 6, lines 50-56; Fig. 2, element 96). Dow et al. does not specifically teach uploading at least the first set of images.

However, Kawaoka et al. teaches uploading all of the images stored in the image capture device to an image synthesizer (col. 13, lines 16-24). One of ordinary skill in the art would have uploaded all of the images stored in the image capture device to an image synthesizer, including the first set of digital images, in order to sequentially display all of the images (col. 13, lines 16-24). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have uploaded all of the images stored in the image capture device to an image synthesizer, including the first set of digital images, in order to sequentially display all of the images.

Regarding claim 30, Kawaoka et al. teaches all the images stored in the device are uploaded to the external device (please see the rejection of claim 29). Kawaoka et

Art Unit: 2615

al. further teaches after the memory card is mounted, the image synthesizer subsequently reads an "image storage file" (Fig. 14) comprising file name tags of the set of representative images and reads out the set of representative images, which are identified by their respective file name tags embedded within each image, used in image synthesis (col. 13, lines 8-24).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have provided an image synthesizer subsequently operating upon only a representative set of images by identifying the image name tag embedded within each image belonging to the set of representative images for purpose of creating a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events (Fig. 16). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided an external device subsequently operating upon only the first set of images by identifying a tag embedded within each image belonging to the first set of images for purpose of creating a composite image comprising the highlights from a number of events.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

**Claims 40-47 are allowed.**

Regarding claim 40, the reason for allowance is as follows: the prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a method for manipulating images stored in a device by selecting for display a different image belonging to the second set of images using the first control; exiting the second set of images using the second control; designating the most recently selected image belonging to the second set of images as a preferred

image, the preferred image thereby becoming a member of both the first and second sets of images.

Regarding claims 41-47, the reason for allowance is as follows: the claims depend from an allowable independent claim.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Jelinek whose telephone number is (571) 272-7366. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 am - 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James

Art Unit: 2615

Groody can be reached at (571) 272-7950. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian Jelinek  
4/7/2005



TUAN HO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER